

N62604.AR.001882
NCBC GULFPORT
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM THE 1 AND 2 JULY 2003 GULFPORT PROJECT MEETING NCBC
GULFPORT MS
7/2/2003
TETRA TECH

Minutes
NCBC Gulfport Project Meeting
July 1-2, 2003

Dates: July 1-2, 2003

Location: NCBC Gulfport, MS

Meeting Attendees

Andy Anders	Air Force Toxicologist
Jason Brown	Prime Contractor (TtNUS)
Gordon Crane	CBC Gulfport IRP Manager
Bob Fisher	Prime Contractor (TtNUS)
David Hadden	GEITA Consultant
Art Hatfield	AFCEE/ERDD
James McClain	AFCEE/ERDD
Rob Pope (Tuesday only)	USEPA
Nancy Rouse	Navy Consultant (EnviroComs)

Tuesday, July 1, 2003

Project Meeting in Lieu of Partnering Meeting

Two days of meetings were scheduled for the Tier I. However, key members of the team were not able to attend because of inclement weather. The attending members decided to hold a project meeting in lieu of a partnering meeting to take advantage of having a number of the team members together.

Hazardous Ranking System (HRS) Question from Public Comments

The HRS/NPL question, (i.e., why was NCBC Gulfport not placed on the NPL with a score of over 60 when 28 was established as the cut off number for the original NPL?), was discussed.

Rob Pope stated that EPA is unlikely to re-rank the site at this point. When asked what triggers the ranking process, Rob stated that it's often the perception of danger from contamination at the site. Further, every state can request one site per year to be added to the NPL. If governor requests it, then it will be added.

Rob stated that most of the Navy packages prepared by SouthDiv when Kim Quenn was the project manager were scored high because the consultants made conservative, educated assumptions in their computations. EPA is not at liberty to make those educated guesses, usually resulting in lower numbers. They must be able to back up every statement in the package. The bottom line was that the information about Gulfport did not meet the criteria that EPA was

looking for when they chose sites for the NPL. One caveat was that ATSDR's recommendations could have pulled them into a more active interest.

Cancer Cluster Data. Andy commented that she has looked at Marie Hansen's map and she doesn't think that the cancers are Herbicide Orange related. She thinks the possibility for any number of problems. She sees other problems, such as shallow wells (30 – 60 feet deep) potentially close to septic tanks. She stated that many cancers appear to be age and heredity-related. It was noted that there are still residents on shallow wells in the affected area.

It was pointed out that ATSDR would be visiting Gulfport during the second week in July. Jim McClain asked if it would be helpful to have Andy Anders support during that visit.

Action Item: Gordon Crane will assess the appropriate level of involvement for Andy Anders in the ATSDR meetings next week.

EPA Role

Rob's purpose for attending the meeting was to assess and make a recommendation to his management about EPA's future participation at NCBC Gulfport. Currently he's only reviewing documents per MDEQ request. Rob is not reviewing the documents himself, rather he's passing them on to a contractor to review them.

Rob was asked if this project has attention at EPA beyond Bob's Merrill's requests for review. Rob responded that Marie Hansen has been contacting people at EPA and that has been getting some level of attention.

Rob himself will no longer be participating at NCBC Gulfport. EPA has reorganized by state and he will no longer be available to work in Mississippi. However, we should continue copying Rob as our point of contact until he tells us otherwise.

EPA was clear that they realize that they have no role (or interest) in signing the decision document.

Document Submittal Process

The goal of this agenda item was to discuss and develop a proposal for improving the document submittal process.

All participants liked the option of having electronic copies of document. The Air Force would also like hard copies of review documents but electronic copies of final documents so that document storage and retrieval would be easier. Bob Fisher explained that his contract specifically calls for hard copies to be delivered.

Different possibilities for electronic submittal were discussed, including sending via e-mail by printing the documents to PDF files, sending CDs in the mail, and using *Collaboration* software via licenses available through the Air Force.

Recommendations:

1. Licenses for *Collaboration* will be provided to Art Conrad, Gordon Crane, and TtNUS to allow a trial use of the software.
2. For those not using *Collaboration*, send documents via PDF if they are small enough (i.e., less than 2MB). Otherwise, send via CD.
3. Exception: Send two copies of all documents via CD to USEPA.

Action Item: Bob Fisher will contact Bob Merrill to discuss how he would like to receive documents and to introduce the concept of using *Collaboration*.

Action Item: Bob Fisher will talk to Art Conrad about budgeting for the change in deliverable format.

Document Review Process

The goal of this discussion was to discuss and develop a proposal for improving the document review process. In particular, to implement a clear internal review process and to identify an end-point for the review and revision steps.

Recommendations:

1. An internal draft will be developed for submittal to the AF and Navy.
2. As a general rule, two weeks will be allowed for review of internal draft.
3. The two-week "rule" can be adjusted based on the size of the document and the number of documents in review.
4. Reviewers must notify the team if they are not able to review the document in the allotted time for any reason.
5. The internal draft document will be followed by a draft final that incorporates comments as appropriate [note, we didn't discuss when comment/response documents would be appropriate]. The draft final would go to regulators and other concerned stakeholders.
6. Comments on the draft final will be discussed at a document review meeting, preferably by teleconference, to be attended by all of the reviewers.
7. A clear letter of approval will be requested from MDEQ to show that the document has come to closure.

Action Item: Art Conrad will speak with Bob Merrill to get his perspective about documenting final resolution on reports.

Focused Feasibility Study (FFS)

A PDF file of the revised FFS was sent out a couple of weeks ago. This version addressed EPA comments and incorporated the conclusions of the risk assessment. EPA stated that because their comments have been addressed that we should not expect any additional comments from them.

Action Item: Bob Fisher will send a copy of the Triplicate Study and letter to David Hadden and Art Hatfield.

Action Item: Jason Brown will make sure that the latest FFS revision was sent to Rob Pope.

A discussion of Sediment Recovery Traps (SRTs) followed. It was decided that there is still a lot of concern in the community, specifically by Marie Hansen, that the SRTs are not adequately stopping contamination from moving from its current locations.

Action Item: Nancy Rouse will prepare a poster exhibit for the next RAB meeting on the SRT function and effectiveness.

Action Item: Jason Brown will develop visual demonstration on how the sediment settles.

David Hadden queried Rob Pope about the level of detail that the EPA might like to see with respect to long term monitoring and land use controls in the decision document. "Rob stated that he would expect no details about either long term monitoring or land use controls.

Decision Document and Proposed Plan

David Hadden pointed out that the Decision Document (DD) is on hold pending the completion of the Responsiveness Summary. However, the need to finalize all of the background documents (i.e., the risk assessment and the FFS) was pointed to as another reason that the DD may need to remain on hold. Further, the ecological risk assessment could impact the DD.

David Hadden suggested that we state which areas we feel have been cleaned to unrestricted levels. Bob Fisher pointed out that he avoided using restricted/unrestricted at sites 8B&C because we may need to use that area for staging during the cap construction. Rob Pope was assured that we'd be doing post-staging sampling to ensure that the site was still clean.

It was pointed out that the projected use of sites 8B&C is warehouses. The remedial design should reflect this usage.

David Hadden asked if we felt there was a need to revise the Proposed Plan. It was agreed that a revision was not needed because no significant differences existed in the FFS that would trigger a new proposed plan.

Action Item: Nancy Rouse will call Andy Anders to get the exact title of EPA's land use control implementation plan. Andy advised us NOT to use the document.

Action Item: Gordon will provide the newest Navy guidance on post remediation controls to Bob Fisher.

Human Health Risk Assessment

The EPA has submitted comments on human health risk assessment and they were happy with the responses to these comments.

Action Item: EPA will send a letter to Art Conrad to summarize their comments.

Ecological Risk Assessment

The participants decided to wait until we hear from NOAA to discuss ecological issues. After hearing Michel's assessment we'll reconvene by telecom to form recommendations for the ecological risk assessment

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Wednesday, July 2, 2003

The meeting opened at 10:30 a.m.

Turkey Creek Issues/City Involvement

Community and RAB members expressed concern about how the city was handling Turkey Creek in light of the dioxin contamination problem there. Specifically, they wanted to know if the city planners were being mindful of the dioxin problem as they made decisions about the creek.

Action Item: Gordon Crane will act as the point person by regularly contacting appropriate city officials and planners to make sure that they're continuing to be mindful of the dioxin contamination.

Action Item: Nancy Rouse and Bob Fisher will develop a poster exhibit to discuss flow concerns in Turkey Creek.

AFCEE Reorganization and Changes in Operation After MOA is Signed

A major reorganization of AFCEE has been proposed. We may have diminished access to Andy Ander's expertise because of her commitments to other issues (e.g. perchlorate).

We should expect AF signature on the MOA no later than July 15th, hopefully by July 11, 2003. Once the MOA is signed, the AF will continue to provide technical support as requested through FY 06. The AF would like to continue their involvement in partnering and the RAB through FY 06. They would like to continue in a voting adjunct role as long as they continue on the partnering team.

Action Item: Gordon will call Charlie Black to expedite sending the Air Force a copy of Navy-signed MOA for AF signature.

FY04 Funding

Of the \$5.3M set aside for this year, one million was pulled back to MMR. We're now down to \$4.3M minus what we've already spent, which is under \$100K.

Action Item: David Hadden will rewrite the AO.

Action Item List

David Hadden requested an opportunity to review the team's action item list. He will issue a revised list separately. Additional points raised and action items assigned as a result of the review of the list follow.

Ecological Risk Assessment

Action Item: Gordon will work to get Michel and Lloyd to Gulfport to schedule a tour of the ecological pathway to expedite the completion of the ecological risk assessment.

Action Item: Art Conrad will organize a meeting in Gulfport in conjunction with the ecological pathway tour to resolve ecological risk assessment issues. Gordon, Michel, Lloyd, Bob Fisher, Any Anders, Art Conrad, and David Hadden will attend the meeting. Recommended that the meeting be held the week after next and be preceded by a teleconference.

Action Item: David Hadden will get the latest ecological risk assessment documents to Andy to include the March 2001 HHRA, the Site Characterization Report, and the Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment (SLERA).

Action Item: Gordon will call Golden Industries to find information about disposition of the drums. No longer in business, but the family is still around. It is known that there were drum crushers on site.

Brownfields Process

Action Item: Bob Fisher will call MDEQ to remind them to send the letter stating that they have received all draft documents required to initiate the Brownfields program.

Action Item: Gordon, will contact Art and copy Steve Beverly about expediting the consent letter and other legal issues that need to be resolved.

Funding has been transferred from the Air Force to the Navy for the Arndt/Bennett lease renewals, the RD cost growth, and the Canal Road culvert project.

Action Item: Art Hatfield will call Art Conrad to recommend changing the team conference calls to Tuesday at 2 pm EST.

The meeting closed at 1:15 p.m.